

Braves in 1995, not any individual achievement, as his greatest and proudest moment in sports.

Watching Greg Maddux on the mound, Braves pitching coach Leo Mazzone says he is well aware that he is seeing a future Hall of Famer. For winning the Cy Young, his glove and spikes are already in the Hall, and Greg Maddux certainly will be voted in as soon as he is eligible, five years after he retires.

As much of a success and a role model as Greg Maddux is on the baseball field, he is also a success and role model in life.

He is a devoted family man, married to a wonderful wife Kathy. They have a daughter, Amanda Paige and a son Chase Alan.

Greg can afford to live anywhere. I know that we are happy that he and his family have chosen to live in Las Vegas and to contribute generously to others in the community, whether signing autographs for fans or giving his time and money towards charitable causes.

Greg states that he has no use for the glamorous life which his money could buy and describes himself as "your average Joe."

Kathy and Greg lead the Maddux Foundation, which is involved in several charitable activities in Las Vegas and Atlanta. The Foundation supports children's homes, domestic crisis shelters, and boys' and girls' clubs.

"Our foundation is low key," Maddux said. "We've never really solicited anyone outside before."

"The goal is to give more money to charity. It's about 'How much can we give?' instead of 'How much can we profit?'"

In recent years, the Madduxes have expanded their philanthropic efforts, and brother Mike also has a foundation that helps children. Greg participates in golf tournaments whose proceeds go to the Southern Nevada chapter of the Candlelighters, which works with families whose children are battling cancer, and Safe Nest, which helps victims of domestic violence.

To my friend, Greg Maddux, a great baseball player and great American I want to thank you for all you have done for Las Vegas and for Nevada, as a role model for all America. You are a breath of fresh air in a troubled world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IRAQ AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I spent the weekend in my home State of Illinois, from the southern part of the State, the metro east, St. Clair County, Madison County, and the city of Chicago, going from one place to another, and it is interesting to me that people will stop and ask me about our going to war in Iraq.

I have not found a single person who makes any excuses for Saddam Hussein. I will not. He is a man who certainly distinguished himself—if that is the word—in the history of this world: for his aggression, his militarism, his inhumane treatment of his own people and his neighbors.

He is someone who cannot be trusted but must be watched carefully and closely. He is someone who must be monitored at all times for fear he could go too far in his development of weapons and his development of military strategies as a threat to the world. Everyone concedes this. I certainly concede it.

We found what he was all about when he invaded Kuwait. We have watched him closely ever since. The United Nations put restrictions on what he can do in defense of his own nation, limitations on his own military power. One of those limitations prohibits weapons of mass destruction: chemical weapons, biological weapons, and nuclear weapons.

The United Nations started inspecting for those weapons after the Persian Gulf war. Saddam Hussein threw every obstacle he could find in their path. He discouraged them when he could, and ultimately the inspections were withdrawn 4 or 5 years ago. We still do a flyover with our planes to watch everything that happens in his country, not to mention all the other sources of intelligence. We worry about him, as we should.

Having said all those things, and the fact that almost everyone acknowledges them to be true, it is still interesting, as I go around my State—a State which is fairly diverse in terms of its economy, in terms of its culture, in terms of its politics—there is no ground swell for America to invade Iraq and to displace Saddam Hussein from power.

The idea of a land invasion, for what the President calls a "regime change" has not brought the people out cheering, as they cheered after September 11 when we said we were going after Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida. Instead, what I hear from the people I speak to in Illinois is that certainly we have to keep an eye on this man, but why should we do it alone? Shouldn't the United States have standing with it a coalition of countries around the world? Why would we do this by ourselves? Isn't it better to invite other nations to be part of it because there is strength in numbers, more clarity of purpose, a sharing of the burden not only of the war but of controlling Iraq after it is defeated?

I can tell you that Thomas Friedman, the foreign Times correspondent for the New York Times, said it best. He said: Our situation in Iraq, if we go it alone, is much the same as the person who walks into the store and sees a sign which says, "If you break it, you own it."

If we displace Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, then, frankly, as those

who displaced him, we will have a burden to bring some stability and security to that country. Is it not better for us, in that circumstance, to have other Western civilized democratic nations standing behind us, not only behind the muzzle of the gun pointed at him but standing in league with us to make sure Iraq is peaceful and safe for a long time?

Let me add one other element that comes up time and again. This is a different world since September 11 of last year. We have to measure our foreign policy against its impact on terrorism. There is not a country in the world which would knowingly attack the United States. We have the best military in the world, the best men and women in uniform, the best technology, but we know we are vulnerable, we are vulnerable to terrorism.

If we make that decision to go it alone in Iraq, to do it by ourselves, and say to the rest of the world, we don't care what the opinion of the United Nations is or any other country is, we will go it alone, would that not invite a backlash from parts of the world that are preaching extremism and fundamentalism? Wouldn't that, unfortunately, sow the seeds of terrorism?

Isn't it far better for us to have a coalition with Arab States, as President Bush's father did in the Persian Gulf, a grand coalition of countries that say Saddam Hussein has to be watched carefully?

When I saw the resolution that President Bush sent us last week, that is not his intension, that is not his design. If you think that trip to the United Nations was an appeal to that body to move forward and do things, it might have been, but, frankly, his resolution he sent to us basically says: Ignore my speech; ignore my visit to the United Nations; ignore the United Nations; give me the authority to do it by myself.

I have no doubt we could win that war, that we could displace Saddam Hussein, but isn't there a better and more cautious and more prudent and more successful strategy we should consider—bringing in the United Nations for real inspections, unconditional inspections, enforced with military force, if they must be, including some troops from the United States, to make sure the inspectors get into the places they need to; and failing that, if Saddam Hussein stops the inspectors, that we issue an ultimatum to him through the United Nations, that if you do not allow unconditional inspections, you can expect there will be a forceful effort by the countries of the world to enforce United Nations resolutions already in place? Isn't that a far better approach than to say, we have a battle plan; we are going to attack; we will send you a note, United Nations, and let you know what happens?

The United Nations should not dictate American policy, but President Bush's father was right. When you can involve a coalition of nations around

the world in your effort to bring peace to a region, you have a far greater chance of success, world acceptance, sharing the burden; and, ultimately, the American people would not stand by themselves but stand in concert with those of like mind and like values.

As I return to Illinois, people tell me over and over again: Senator, when you go back, please go to the floor of the Senate and express our feelings that we do need a coalition of force, not just for the principle and value of it but for the military significance of it, not just so we are not standing alone but so we are validated in the eyes of the world that what we are standing for is not just a narrow interest of the United States but in the best interest of a free and peaceful world.

That is what makes sense. That is what we ought to move forward with.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I ask my friend from Illinois, is it true, when you returned to Illinois, people were asking about things other than Iraq?

Mr. DURBIN. Exactly true.

Mr. REID. Are people concerned about the stumbling, staggering, faltering economy?

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator from Nevada, that is where I was headed next.

This chart, which I have brought to the floor, talks about the lost private sector jobs in the last 50 years. Look at what has occurred under President Eisenhower through George W. Bush. Look at the only period that shows red ink, the net loss of jobs; and it turns out to be under President Bush.

The people of Illinois talk about Iraq because it is in the headlines. That is all the media talks about. But when it comes to the issues they worry about, this is what they are concerned about. There are not enough jobs, not enough good-paying jobs.

Unfortunately, under this administration, the economy is not even a major issue. They are ignoring it. I asked last week—and I will renew my request to the President—can you give us 1 hour a week on America's economy, 1 hour to talk about income and job security? That is a valid issue.

Take a look at long-term unemployment. It has more than doubled under President Bush. In January 2001, when he came to office, there were 648,000 under long-term unemployment, people unemployed for half a year. That number has more than doubled in this period of time. The President may rally America to stand behind him, as he should, on the war on terrorism and foreign policy. But he ought to rally America to work, give people opportunities so they can be employed, so they have some opportunity to enjoy the benefits of this country.

We are facing now the weakest economic growth in 50 years. This chart shows economic growth, the average rate of growth over the last 2 years.

Under President George W. Bush, it has been 1.0 percent. The next worst President, since Eisenhower, was his father. Then you have to go back to Gerald Ford to find another bad period of time.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don't see anyone here wishing to speak. It is my understanding morning business has, under the previous order, ended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. The next period of time is for debate on the cloture motion; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate is to resume consideration of H.R. 5093.

Mr. REID. So is it now time to debate the Dodd amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, to discuss the Dodd amendment.

Mr. REID. I don't see anyone here, so I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be recognized for 10 minutes and that the Republicans be given an extra 10 minutes also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will yield at least a portion of my time to my friend from North Dakota.

Look at the rate of growth under the Bush Presidency. Is it any wonder the President does not want to talk about the economy?

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I should have included that this time comes from the debate on the Dodd amendment, that that number be lessened by 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. If you have the weakest economic growth in 50 years, there is no reason for you to talk about it. Certainly this Bush White House will not. They won't bring this issue to the American people because they don't have much to tell us.

The news we have seen on the economy is well known. Take a look at what has happened in terms of the market value of those who own stocks, the New York Stock Exchange and Nasdaq, \$4.5 trillion of lost stock market wealth between January 2001, when President Bush came to office, and August 2002. That, of course, represents not just a loss in stock market wealth, it is a loss of savings. It is a loss of college savings accounts for kids. It is a loss of pension plans, 401(k)s, and people making new plans with their lives because of the bottom falling out of the stock market.

Of course, last week we saw the Dow Jones crashing even further. The people in the Bush administration do not

want to discuss this. They don't want to talk about turning this economy around. They want to talk about rallying troops.

Let's rally the American people to get the economy back on its feet. Let the President give us 1 hour a week talking about what we can do to try to get this economy moving forward again.

This stock market decline is a new record. If you look at the sharpest percentage decline in the Standard & Poor's 500, only Herbert Hoover has a worse record than President George W. Bush. Herbert Hoover in the Great Depression saw the stock market decline by 30 percent. So far, under President George W. Bush we have seen a decline of 21 percent—historic declines. It is no wonder the President does not want to discuss this.

Look as well at what workers are facing who still are on the job. The cost of health insurance has inflated dramatically since the President came to office: family coverage, 16 percent; individual coverage, 27 percent.

The biggest single complaint I have heard from businesses, labor unions, and individuals in the State of Illinois: the cost of health insurance. Senator, what are you going to do about it? The honest answer is that this Congress has done nothing about it, nor has the President proposed anything significant.

When we consider the issues we should be about, national security is No. 1, I agree, but it is not the only issue facing America. We need to discuss issues of pension security and income security and health care security and the future of Social Security. Those are issues American families worry about every single day. We in the Senate should worry about them as well.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the Senator from Illinois. He is right. Iraq is not an irrelevant issue. It is a very important issue. The President will find, as we finish all of these discussions, that we will have a pretty unified voice on what we do around the world, but we need to do that through the United Nations, with other partner countries, as part of a coalition. At the end of the day, this country will have led the way towards that result.

It is also the case, when most people sit down around the supper table and talk about their lives, they are talking about subjects that are much different from Iraq. They are discussing issues such as: Do we have a good job; does it pay well; do we have job security; do we send our kids to good schools; do grandpa and grandma have decent health care; do we live in a safe neighborhood? All of those issues exist as well.

There are some who don't want to talk about any of those issues. They